



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|

10/799,507

03/12/2004

Young-Choon Moon

2004993-0043
(VP1/03-01)

8237

24280 7590 02/23/2006

CHOATE, HALL & STEWART LLP
TWO INTERNATIONAL PLACE
BOSTON, MA 02110

EXAMINER

RAO, DEEPAK R

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1624

DATE MAILED: 02/23/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| | | | |
|------------------------------|--------------------------------------|------------------------------------------|--|
| Office Action Summary | Application No. 10/799,507 | Applicant(s) MOON, YOUNG-CHOON | |
| | Examiner Deepak Rao | Art Unit 1624 | |

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 December 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 and 17-22 are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11, 18, 19, 21 and 22 are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 12, 17 and 20 are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>12082005</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

This office action is in response to the amendment filed on December 8, 2005.

Claims 1-12 and 17-22 are pending in this application.

Withdrawn Rejections/Objections:

Applicant is notified that any outstanding rejection/objection that is not expressly maintained in this office action has been withdrawn or rendered moot in view of applicant's amendments and/or remarks.

The following objections/rejections are necessitated by the amendment:

Claim Objections

Claim 20 is objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c) as being in improper form because a multiple dependent claim can not depend from any other multiply dependent claim. See MPEP § 608.01(n).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 17 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The following reasons apply:

Art Unit: 1624

1. Claim 17 recites the limitation "said disease or condition" in last two lines. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. The claim recites "A method of treating or lessening the severity of diabetes" in lines 1-2, and accordingly, the last two lines should be modified. Further, the claim does not recite that the 'method of treating' is with respect to "diabetes in a patient" in the first two lines. The following modification of language is suggested:

17. (Currently amended) A method of treating or lessening the severity of diabetes in a patient comprising administering to ~~a~~ said patient a compound of formula I:

.....

in an amount to treat or lessen severity of ~~said disease or condition~~ diabetes in said patient.

2. Claim 20 multiply depends from claims 18 (drawn to a method of treating stroke) or claim 19 (multiply dependent on claims 17 and 18 drawn to a method of treating diabetes and stroke respectively). The method of claim 20 includes the use of 'an additional therapeutic agent for treating diabetes', however, the claim depends from the claims which are specifically drawn to "a method of treating stroke". It is not understood why a therapeutic agent for diabetes is administered in a method of treating stroke.

The following rejections are under new grounds:

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it

Art Unit: 1624

pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for a method of inhibiting GSK-3 activity in a standard biological assay, does not reasonably provide enablement for a method of inhibiting GSK-3 activity in a biological sample generally for the purpose of blood transfusion, organ transplantation, etc. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims.

In evaluating the enablement question, several factors are to be considered. Note *In re Wands*, 8 USPQ2d 1400 and *Ex parte Forman*, 230 USPQ 546. The factors include: 1) The nature of the invention, 2) the state of the prior art, 3) the predictability or lack thereof in the art, 4) the amount of direction or guidance present, 5) the presence or absence of working examples, 6) the breadth of the claims, and 7) the quantity of experimentation needed. The determination that “undue experimentation” would have been needed to make and use the claimed invention is not a single, simple factual determination. Rather, it is a conclusion reached by weighing all the above noted factual considerations.

The instant claim is drawn to ‘a method of inhibiting GSK-3 activity in a biological sample’ and the term “biological sample” as per the definition in the specification (page 31, lines 10-13) “includes, without limitation, cell cultures or extracts thereof; biopsied material obtained from a mammal or extracts thereof; and blood, saliva, urine, feces, semen, tears, or other body fluids or extracts thereof”.

First, the instant claim appears to be a 'reach through' claim. Reach through claims, in general have a format drawn to mechanistic, receptor binding or enzymatic functionality and

Art Unit: 1624

thereby reach through to the corresponding therapeutic method of any or all diseases, disorders or conditions, for which they lack written description and enabling disclosure in the specification thereby requiring undue experimentation for one of skill in the art to practice the invention.

As can be seen from the definition of the term “biological sample”, without limitation it reads on many and all types of biological samples, which can include mammals or animals and therefore, the claimed method is seen to encompass an inhibitory method wherein the compound is administered to an animal. This is further evident from the purpose of the inhibition of GSK-3 activity stated in page 31, lines 14-17, which includes for example, blood transfusion, organ-transplantation, etc. As the inhibition of GSK-3 activity in a biological sample is disclosed to be useful for blood transfusion, organ-transplantation, etc., it implicitly reads on the inherent therapeutic methods characterized by the activity, which as per the specification includes numerous types of disorders.

The sole testing assay provided in the specification at pages 31-32 is to test the ability of the compounds to inhibit GSK-3 β activity using a standard coupled enzyme system, however, there is insufficient guidance in the disclosure regarding the provided assay. First, the specification provides that the coupled enzyme system is provided in Fox et al., however, the cited article deals with inhibition of p38 MAP kinase activity. Next, applicant has not provided how this correlates with the efficacy in all types of biological samples encompassed by the instant method and their use in the various purposes wherein the inhibition activity is useful. For example, blood transfusion is the process of transferring blood or blood-based products from one person into the circulatory system of another. Blood transfusions may be seen as a procedure to treat some medical conditions, such as massive blood loss due to trauma, surgery, shock and

Art Unit: 1624

where the red cell producing mechanism (or some other normal and essential component) fails. Similarly, an organ transplantation is the transplantation of a whole or partial organ from one body to another (or from a donor site on the patient's own body), for the purpose of replacing the recipient's damaged or failing organ with a working one from the donor site. As can be seen from the above, without limitation these purposes are intended for therapeutic methods and applicant has not provided competent evidence sufficient to enable the claimed method.

Further, the instantly claimed method alternatively recites the use of 'a pharmaceutical composition comprising the compound of formula I and a pharmaceutically acceptable carrier, adjuvant or vehicle' as being added to the biological sample, see the last three lines of the claim. A pharmaceutical composition of the kind recited in the instant claims is generally used for internal administration type therapeutic methods. Therefore, the instant claim appears to be directed to the various types of therapeutic methods associated with GSK-3 inhibition activity.

Thus, factors such as "sufficient working examples", "the level of skill in the art" and "predictability", etc. have been demonstrated to be sufficiently lacking in the use of the invention. In view of the breadth of the claim, the chemical nature of the invention, the unpredictability of ligand-receptor interactions in general, and the lack of working examples regarding the activity of the claimed compounds, one having ordinary skill in the art would have to undergo an undue amount of experimentation to use the invention commensurate in scope with the claims.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 1-11, 18-19 and 21-22 are allowed. The references of record do not teach or fairly suggest the instantly claimed compounds.

Receipt is acknowledged of the Information Disclosure Statement filed on December 8, 2005 and a copy is enclosed herewith.


Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Deepak Rao whose telephone number is (571) 272-0672. The examiner can normally be reached on Tuesday-Friday from 6:30am to 5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, James O. Wilson, can be reached at (571) 272-0661. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 272-1600.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


Deepak Rao
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1624

February 21, 2006